

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 21, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully noted.

Appreciation is expressed to Examiner Tran for his courtesy and constructive assistance during the telephone interview held with undersigned counsel on June 27, 2006.

Statement of substance of interview

During the interview held with the Examiner on June 27, 2006, the central distinctions between the invention, as defined in all of the pending claims, and the applied references were discussed in detail. It was pointed out, in particular, that the present invention is directed to detection of a fraud event in a distributed telecommunications network in which the network enables performance of at least two functions associated with different functional groups of elements. According to a particular novel feature of the invention, the fraud determination is based on an analysis of data records originating from at least two elements each belonging to at least a respective one of the at least two functional groups. In contrast, each of the applied references only discloses systems that perform analysis based on data retrieved from two sources of the same type. Specifically, each reference discloses performing analysis based on information obtained from two call data records, which are records that belong to precisely the same functional group.

It is a comparatively simple matter to analyze data from two sources of identical type, whereas analysis of records data from elements belonging to different functional groups is a more complex operation in that, prior to the analysis, it is necessary to ensure that the various data used relate to the same communication session, and possibly to the same part of that session.

Thus, the concept of detecting a fraud event by analyzing records data obtain from at least two functional group elements, each element belonging to at least a respective one of at least two functional groups having respectively different characteristic, is not disclosed in or suggested by the applied references, whether considered alone or in any reasonable combination.

All of the independent claims have been amended to clearly define this distinguishing feature of the present invention, particularly by their identification of the at least two functional groups as having respectively different characteristics.

In addition, claim 3 has been amended to further distinguish the invention over the prior art by its recitation that the at least two elements that are employed in the analysis are associated with functions in respectively different network layers.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that the prior art rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn, that claims 1-20 be allowed and that the application be found in allowable condition.

Appln. No. 09/995,792
Amd. dated July 21, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 21, 2006

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By


Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:nlw
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\E\eci\Ronen1\PTO\2006-07-21-amendment.doc